therefore, I am opinion, that the plaintiff has failed to establish a title to the interposition of this court, and his bill must, therefore, be dismissed.

- J. MASON CAMPBELL for Complainant.
- T. PARKIN SCOTT for Defendant.

[The decree in this case was affirmed by the Court of Appeals.]

SAMUEL CHEW, EX'R OF REBECCA GIBSON

VS.

THE PRESIDENT, DIRECTORS
AND COMPANY OF THE

FARMERS' BANK OF MARY-LAND ET AL. DECEMBER TERM, 1848.

[PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS—ANNUITY TO A WIDOW IN LIEU OF DOWER A CHARGE UPON LANDS—LIMITATIONS—LAPSE OF TIME—STALE DEMANDS.]

THE rule that communications which a client makes to his legal adviser for the purpose of professional advice or aid, shall not be disclosed, stands upon such firm grounds of public policy, and is so well fortified by authority, that it would be impossible to contest it.

Upon every such communication, made by a party to his counsel, attorney, or solicitor, the seal of the law is placed and remains forever, unless removed

by the party himself, for whose protection the rule was established.

Communications made by a client to a witness in relation to the provisions of her will, in the drawing of which the witness was acting as her attorney, the reasons assigned for such provisions, and the conversations that took place upon that subject, fall clearly within the rule, and must not be disclosed.

But, a witness must disclose any information, pertinent to the cause, which has no necessary connection with his professional character, and which he did not acquire by reason of the confidence reposed in him on account of that character.

When a witness makes objection to a question on this ground, he must be understood as making it in behalf of the client; and, therefore, when the client, or the party representing him, stands by, and does not release the witness from the obligation not to reveal the information, he must be understood to approve of the objection, and to insist upon his privilege.

The proper way to bring the question of privileged communications before a court of equity, is for the witness, when he declines answering the interrogatory,